# RECENT CASES.

APPEAL—FEDERAL QUESTION—ERROR TO STATE COURT—LIABILITY ON INJUNCTION BOND.—TULLOCK v. MULVANE, 22 Sup. Ct. 372.—*Held,* a claim of immunity for attorney's fees as an element of damages under an injunction bond given in a Federal court presents a Federal question for review on error to the State court from the Supreme Court of the United States.

The validity of such a bond, the authority of the Federal court, and in general the proceedings, decrees and orders of that court involve Federal questions under Rev. Stat. Section 709. *Dupasseur v. Rochereau,* 21 Wall. 130; *Avery v. Popper,* 179 U. S. 305; *Meyers v. Block,* 120 U. S. 206. But where none of these is questioned and only the liability of a surety under the bond is to be decided, it is denied by three of the justices, in a strong dissenting opinion, that any Federal question is involved. They contend that the bond is to be interpreted like any other contract; that liability under it is purely a question of general law, and that the refusal of a State court to accept the view of the Federal courts on the subject, expressed in former decisions between other parties, is not reviewable by the Supreme Court of the United States as denying an immunity claimed by virtue of "an authority exercised under the United States." Rev. Stat. Section 709; *Provident, etc., Soc. v. Ford,* 114 U. S. 635; *Winona & St. P. R. R. Co. v. Plainview,* 143 U. S. 371.

APPEAL—REVIEW—OBJECTIONS NOT RAISED BELOW.—BRINCKERHOFF ET AL. v. FARIAS ET AL., 63 N. E. 436 (N. Y.).—In an action to procure the settlement of plaintiffs' accounts as trustees, the defendant filed some general exceptions to all that referee had decided, but did not object to the accounts as filed and neither on the trial nor during the hearing before the referee made any specific objection thereto. *Held,* that an objection raised by him specifically for the first time in the Court of Appeals on an appeal from the judgment will not be considered.

This decision departs from the findings in *Watts v. Waddle,* 31 U. S. (6 Pet.) 389; *Campbell v. Stakes,* 2 Wend. 137. It applies the rule set forth in *Markham v. Washburn* (Com. Pl.), 18 N. Y. Supp. 355; *Dodge v. Cornelius,* 168 N. Y. 242, which gives a definite limit to matter for review.

CARRIERS—NEGLIGENCE—DUTY TO ANNOUNCE STATIONS.—HOUSTON & T. C. R. R. v. GOODYEAR, 66 S. W. 862 (C. C. A.).—A railroad company, in absence of statute, is not negligent as a matter of law in failing to announce arrival of its trains at stations.

That trains must stop at the stations for a reasonable length of time, 5 Am. & Eng. Ency. 565, and authorities in note; *Teller v. N. Y. C. R. Co.,* 2 A. A. Dec. (N. Y.) 480. Company liable for any injury resulting from violation of this duty. *Washington, etc., R. Co. v. Harmon,* 171 U. S. 571.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—EQUAL PROTECTION OF LAWS—STATUTES.—CONNOLLY ET AL. v. UNION SEWER PIPE CO., 22 Sup. Ct. 431.—A discrimination in